arXiv:1407.2772v2 [hep-th] 17 Nov 2014

International Journal of Modern Physics D
© World Scientific Publishing Company

Particular Solutions in Bimetric Theory and Their Implications

S.F. Hassan
Department of Physics & The Oskar Klein Centre,
Stockholm University, AlbaNova University Centre, SE-106 91 Stockholm, Sweden
fawad@fysik.su.se

Angnis Schmidt-May
Department of Physics & The Oskar Klein Centre,
Stockholm University, AlbaNova University Centre, SE-106 91 Stockholm, Sweden
angnis.schmidt-may@fysik.su.se

Mikael von Strauss
UPMC-CNRS, UMR7095, Institut d'Astrophysique de Paris, GReCO,
98bis boulevard Arago, F-75014 Paris, France
strauss@iap.fr

Received Day Month Year
Revised Day Month Year

Ghost-free bimetric theory can describe gravity in the presence of an extra spin-2 field. We study certain aspects of dynamics in this theory: (i) It is shown that if either of the metrics is an Einstein solution then the other is always forced to be Einstein, too. For a class of bimetric models this constraint is stronger and as soon as one metric is Einstein, the other metric is forced to be proportional to it. As a consequence, the models in this class avoid a branch of pathological solutions that exhibit determinant singularities or nonlinear ghosts. These constraints persists in a generalized form when sources are included, but are destroyed in the massive gravity limit of the theory. (ii) For another class of bimetric models, we show the existence of solutions that do not admit a massive gravity limit. A bimetric model that could exhibit a nonlinear version of "partially massless" symmetry belongs to both these classes. It is argued that if such a model exist, its symmetry will not survive in the massive gravity limit.

Keywords: modified gravity, massive gravity

PACS numbers: 04.50.Kd

1. Introduction & Results

The ghost-free bimetric theory[1,2] describes non-derivative interactions of two spin-2 fields, say, $g_{\mu\nu}$ and $f_{\mu\nu}$, through a potential $V(g, f, \beta_n)$. The interactions are parametrized by five parameters β_n ($n = 0 \cdots 4$). This theory can be interpreted as a theory of gravity, with a metric $g_{\mu\nu}$, in the presence of an extra spin-2 field $f_{\mu\nu}$. In one limit, $g_{\mu\nu}$ is mostly massless and the theory is closer to General Relativity.[3] In

an opposite limit, the field $f_{\mu\nu}$ gets frozen to a fixed background and $g_{\mu\nu}$ becomes a massive spin-2 field. This is the massive gravity limit.[4–8] The crucial point is that these theories do not contain the Boulware-Deser ghost.[9] However, the implications of such spin-2 interactions and many aspects of their dynamics are far from fully understood.

To be viable, bimetric models must admit solutions without pathologies. Another interesting aspect is the possible relevance to nonlinear realizations of partial masslessness. In this paper we study some aspects of dynamics of bimetric models that are relevant for these issues. Most of our results are in the context of two classes of bimetric models, that we call the "β_i-models" and the "symmetric" models.

In the β_i-models, β_i denotes one of the three parameters $\beta_1, \beta_2, \beta_3$, while the other two are set to zero. The remaining parameters β_0 and β_4 take generic values. Thus, for example, the β_1 model is defined by $\beta_2 = \beta_3 = 0$. We show that the dynamics of these models are more constrained than in generic bimetric models. In particular they avoid pathological branches of solutions that arise along with healthy solutions.

In the symmetric models, the parameters β_n satisfy the property $\alpha^{4-n}\beta_n = \alpha^n\beta_{4-n}$, where $\alpha = m_f/m_g$ is the ratio of the Planck masses of the two spin-2 fields. We show that this class of models always contains solutions that do not admit a massive gravity limit. This result is relevant for the viability of the proposal that the bimetric framework could admit a nonlinear generalization of linear partial masslessness.

All our considerations here are at the classical level and in this work we do not address the question whether quantum corrections maintain the structure of the above models or not. Our results are summarized below.

1.1. *Summary of results*

Einstein and proportional solutions: In the absence of sources, bimetric equations always admit solutions where at least one metric is Einstein (that is, a solution to Einstein's vacuum equations).

- We show that in any bimetric theory, if one of the metrics is Einstein, then the dynamics also force the other metric to be Einstein.
- In the β_i-models (defined above) the constraint is stronger: If either metric is Einstein, the other metric is not only Einstein, but also proportional to the first metric.
- Similar statements apply to bimetric solutions in the presence of matter sources, but now only when the matter couplings allow for GR solutions (that is, solutions of Einstein's equations in the presence of sources).
- The β_i models do not contain branches of ill-behaved solutions exhibiting determinant singularities[10] or nonlinear ghosts.[11,12] Such solutions, that can arise in other models, represent examples of non-proportional Einstein backgrounds not permitted in the β_i-models.

It is obvious that the above constraints do not arise in the massive gravity limit of the theory, where the reference metric is always Einstein without forcing the massive metric to be so.

Symmetric models and solutions with no massive gravity limit: Massive gravity is defined with a fixed reference metric $\bar{f}_{\mu\nu}$. Hence the massive gravity limit of bimetric theory also involves truncating its solution space to a class that leads to the specific $\bar{f}_{\mu\nu}$, and not to other reference metrics. Obviously, only those properties of bimetric theory that admit a similar truncation have a chance of surviving the massive gravity limit. There also exist bimetric solutions that lead to singular metrics and have no massive gravity limit.

- We show that symmetric bimetric models, with $\alpha^{4-n}\beta_n = \alpha^n\beta_{4-n}$, always contain solutions with no massive gravity limit, giving rise to singular metrics in the limit.
- The symmetric models include the candidate PM bimetric model (which is also a β_2-model). Based on known results, we argue that the PM gauge symmetry requires the presence of solutions with no massive gravity limit and that such a gauge symmetry, if present, will not admit a non-singular massive gravity truncation, except for Einstein backgrounds (and some other simple solutions).

From this point of view, the absence of a nonlinear PM symmetry in massive gravity is expected and does not rule out a nonlinear realization in the PM bimetric model or some generalization of it.

The paper is organized as follows. In section 2 we review some aspects of bimetric theory required for our analysis and make the notion of its massive gravity limit precise. Section 3 studies Einstein backgrounds and demonstrates the constraining nature of the bimetric equations of motion. We also point out the absence of known ill-behaved solutions in β_i-models. In section 4, we analyze solutions with no massive gravity limit and discuss the implications for some counter arguments against the candidate PM bimetric model.

2. Review of bimetric theory and its massive gravity limit

Here we review some aspects of the ghost-free bimetric theory needed for the rest of the paper.

2.1. *Action and equations of motion*

The ghost-free bimetric action for two symmetric rank-two tensors $g_{\mu\nu}$ and $f_{\mu\nu}$ is given by,[1]

$$S[g,f] = \int \mathrm{d}^4x \left(m_g^2 \sqrt{|g|}\, R(g) + m_f^2 \sqrt{|f|}\, R(f) - 2m^4 \sqrt{|g|}\, V(S) \right) . \qquad (1)$$

Here, the kinetic structures for both tensors are the ordinary Einstein-Hilbert terms with Planck masses m_g and m_f. The interaction potential V is a linear combination of elementary symmetric polynomials $e_n(S)$ constructed out of the square-root matrix $S \equiv \sqrt{g^{-1}f}$,

$$V(S) = \sum_{n=0}^{4} \beta_n e_n(S)\,, \tag{2}$$

with arbitrary coefficients β_n. The $e_n(S)$ are given by the recursive relations,

$$e_n(S) = \tfrac{1}{n}\sum_{k=0}^{n-1}(-1)^{k+n+1}\mathrm{Tr}(S^{n-k})e_k(S)\,, \qquad e_0(S) = 1\,. \tag{3}$$

So that $e_4(S) = \det S$ and $e_n(S) = 0$ for $n > 4$, if S is a (4×4)-matrix. $V(S)$ generalizes the massive gravity potential[5] as formulated in[6] and shown to be free of the Boulware-Deser ghost instability.[1,2,7,8] In this formulation it is evident that the relation $\sqrt{|g|}\; e_n(S) = \sqrt{|f|}\; e_{4-n}(S^{-1})$ implies the property,[1]

$$\sqrt{|g|}\; V\left(\sqrt{g^{-1}f}\,;\beta_n\right) = \sqrt{|f|}\; V\left(\sqrt{f^{-1}g}\,;\beta_{4-n}\right)\,. \tag{4}$$

Variation of (1) with respect to g and f gives two sets of equations of motion. In terms of the Einstein tensor $\mathcal{G}_{\mu\nu} = R_{\mu\nu} - \frac{1}{2}g_{\mu\nu}R$ for $g_{\mu\nu}$ (and similarly $\tilde{\mathcal{G}}_{\mu\nu}$ for $f_{\mu\nu}$), they read,

$$\mathcal{G}_{\mu\nu} + \tfrac{m^4}{m_g^2}V_{\mu\nu} = 0\,, \qquad \alpha^2\tilde{\mathcal{G}}_{\mu\nu} + \tfrac{m^4}{m_g^2}\tilde{V}_{\mu\nu} = 0\,, \tag{5}$$

where,

$$V_{\mu\nu} \equiv -\frac{2}{\sqrt{|g|}}\frac{\partial(\sqrt{|g|}\;V)}{\partial g^{\mu\nu}}\,, \qquad \tilde{V}_{\mu\nu} \equiv -\frac{2}{\sqrt{|f|}}\frac{\partial(\sqrt{|g|}\;V)}{\partial f^{\mu\nu}}\,. \tag{6}$$

In terms of matrices $Y_{(n)}(S)$, the potential contributions have the structure,[6,13]

$$V_{\mu\nu} \equiv g_{\mu\rho}\sum_{n=0}^{3}\beta_n[Y_{(n)}(S)]^{\rho}{}_{\nu}\,, \qquad \tilde{V}_{\mu\nu} \equiv f_{\mu\rho}\sum_{n=0}^{3}\beta_{4-n}[Y_{(n)}(S^{-1})]^{\rho}{}_{\nu}\,, \tag{7}$$

where $Y_{(n)}$ are given as functions of the matrix S by,

$$[Y_{(n)}(S)]^{\rho}{}_{\nu} \equiv \sum_{k=0}^{n}(-1)^k e_k(S)\,[S^{n-k}]^{\rho}{}_{\nu}\,. \tag{8}$$

$\tilde{V}_{\mu\nu}$ can be directly obtained from $V_{\mu\nu}$ through $S \to S^{-1}$, $\beta_n \to \beta_{4-n}$ as implied by (4). For later use we note an identity for $Y_{(n)}$,

$$\mathrm{Tr}(S\,Y_{(n)}(S)) = (-1)^n(n+1)e_{n+1}(S)\,. \tag{9}$$

The $g_{\mu\nu}$ equations and the Bianchi identity, $\nabla^{\sigma}\mathcal{G}_{\sigma\nu} = 0$, give the Bianchi constraint,

$$\nabla^{\sigma}V_{\sigma\nu} = 0\,. \tag{10}$$

There is a similar constraint arising from the $f_{\mu\nu}$ equations but due to the overall diffeomorphism invariance the two constraints are equivalent.

Note that due to the property (4), the bimetric action (1) retains its form under the simultaneous interchanges,

$$g_{\mu\nu} \leftrightarrow f_{\mu\nu}\,, \qquad m_g \leftrightarrow m_f\,, \qquad \beta_n \to \beta_{4-n}\,, \tag{11}$$

or the related transformations,

$$\alpha^{-1} g_{\mu\nu} \leftrightarrow \alpha f_{\mu\nu}\,, \qquad \alpha^{4-n}\beta_n \to \alpha^n \beta_{4-n}\,, \qquad \text{where } \alpha \equiv m_f/m_g\,. \tag{12}$$

We emphasize that (12) keeps m_g and m_f unaltered and so is different from, and less restrictive than, (11). These transformations map the action $S[g,f]$ (1) with parameters $\{\beta_n\}$ to a similar action with different parameters $\{\hat\beta_m \sim \beta_{4-n}\}$. In section 4, we consider symmetric models with $\alpha^{4-n}\beta_n = \alpha^n\beta_{4-n}$, when (12) maps the model back to itself.

2.2. *Proportional backgrounds*

Many of the results in the present paper involve proportional backgrounds, but the implications extend to the general theory. A useful class of solutions to the bimetric equations (5) is given by the ansatz $\bar f_{\mu\nu} = c^2 \bar g_{\mu\nu}$. This reduces (5) to two copies of Einstein equations,[3]

$$\bar{\mathcal{G}}_{\mu\nu} = -\Lambda\, \bar g_{\mu\nu}\,, \qquad \Lambda = \tfrac{m^4}{m_g^2}(\beta_0 + 3c\beta_1 + 3c^2\beta_2 + c^3\beta_3) \tag{13}$$

$$\bar{\tilde{\mathcal{G}}}_{\mu\nu} = -\tilde\Lambda\, c^2 \bar g_{\mu\nu}\,, \qquad \tilde\Lambda = \tfrac{m^4}{m_f^2 c^4}(c\beta_1 + 3c^2\beta_2 + 3c^3\beta_3 + c^4\beta_4)\,. \tag{14}$$

Since $\bar{\mathcal{G}}_{\mu\nu} = \bar{\tilde{\mathcal{G}}}_{\mu\nu}$, the above equations imply,

$$\Lambda = c^2 \tilde\Lambda\,. \tag{15}$$

This is a quartic equation that determines c in terms of the parameters β_n and α. Obviously $\bar g_{\mu\nu}$ and $\bar f_{\mu\nu}$ now coincide with solutions in GR with appropriate cosmological constants. Generic matter couplings of g and f drive the solutions away from proportional backgrounds.

These solutions are useful in elucidating the behavior of bimetric theories. Only around such backgrounds the theory has a well defined mass spectrum where fluctuations $\delta g = g - \bar g$ and $\delta f = f - \bar f$ decompose into a massless mode $\delta g + \alpha^2 \delta f$ and a massive mode $c^2\delta g - \delta f$ of constant Fierz-Pauli mass,[3]

$$m_{\rm FP}^2 = m_0^2(c\beta_1 + 2c^2\beta_2 + c^3\beta_3)\,. \tag{16}$$

m_0^2 depends on normalization of the fluctuations. The presence of the massive fluctuation distinguishes the bimetric background from the corresponding GR solution. Some particular backgrounds involving a mass scale M_b are rendered unstable by the massive mode for,

$$0 < m_{\rm FP} < M_b\,. \tag{17}$$

For dS backgrounds $M_b^2 = 2\Lambda/3$[14] and for the Schwarzschild solutions, $M_b \sim 1/r_h$, where r_h is the black hole radius.[15,16] For such solutions we restrict to $m_{\rm FP} > M_b$. When $m_{\rm FP}^2 = 2\Lambda/3$, the linear theory develops an extra "partially massless" symmetry[17] and propagates 6, rather than 7, modes.[18]

2.3. *The massive gravity limit*

Here we review the massive gravity limit of bimetric theory, emphasizing a caveat. Massive gravity, with $g_{\mu\nu}$ as the massive field, is obtained in the limit,[1,19]

$$\alpha \longrightarrow \infty\,, \qquad m_g = \text{fixed}\,, \qquad \alpha^{-2}\beta_4 = \beta_4' = \text{fixed}\,, \tag{18}$$

while β_n, for $n < 4$, are required to remain finite. The scaling of β_4 allows for massive gravity with non-flat reference metrics. This limit can be taken in two ways:

1) Without reference to specific solutions, one can take the limit (18) on the bimetric equations (5) (not on the action that contains $m_f^2 \to \infty$),

$$\mathcal{G}_{\mu\nu} + m_g^{-2} m^4 V_{\mu\nu} = 0\,, \tag{19}$$

$$\tilde{\mathcal{G}}_{\mu\nu} + \lambda_f f_{\mu\nu} = 0\,, \qquad \lambda_f = \tfrac{\beta_4' m^4}{m_g^2}\,,. \tag{20}$$

The first equation follows from the massive gravity action for a general reference metric $f_{\mu\nu}$[6,8] (or from[5] for $f_{\mu\nu} = \eta_{\mu\nu}$). The second equation requires that $f_{\mu\nu}$ solves the vacuum Einstein equation, but a specific solution needs to be selected by hand. It is obvious that both of these equations cannot be obtained from a single action.

2) The problem with the absence of an action and the arbitrariness of $f_{\mu\nu}$ can be circumvented by taking the massive gravity limit in the bimetric action, after expanding it around a bimetric solution:[20,21] Consider a solution (or family of solutions) $f^0_{\mu\nu}(\alpha)$ in bimetric theory and expand the action (1) around it for canonically normalized perturbations χ,

$$f_{\mu\nu} = f^0_{\mu\nu}(\alpha) + m_f^{-1}\chi_{\mu\nu}\,. \tag{21}$$

Since the new action will not contain positive powers of m_f, the limit (18) can be taken to obtain a massive gravity action with a specific reference metric $f^0_{\mu\nu}(\alpha = \infty)$. Equation (20) becomes redundant and is replaced by a decoupled linear field $\chi_{\mu\nu}$.[a] This way of taking the limit is cumbersome in practice, but it justifies regarding massive gravity as a limit of bimetric theory (for a specific bimetric solution).

In the above construction, a crucial point to note is that *massive gravity limits exist only for bimetric solutions that remain non-singular in the limit* $\alpha \to \infty$. Then the limit further truncates the space of such solutions down to the subclass that reduces to the specified $f^0_{\mu\nu}(\alpha = \infty)$ (*e.g.*, choosing de Sitter over Schwarzschild-de Sitter).

[a]The appearance of linear fields in a nonlinear action is consistent only in the absence of general covariance.

In section 4, we will consider bimetric models with solutions that become singular and do not admit a massive gravity limit. We also discuss the implication of this for the massive gravity limit of the candidate "partially masslessness" bimetric model.

3. Results on Einstein solutions in bimetric theory

In this section we will show that in any bimetric theory if one of the metrics is an Einstein metric, the equations force the other one to be Einstein as well. For certain classes of ghost-free models, that we call the β_i-models, the constraint is even stronger: If either metric is an Einstein metric, then the two metrics have to be proportional to each other. Finally we point out that the β_i-models avoid solutions with determinant singularities and nonlinear ghosts.

3.1. *General case: Einstein implies Einstein*

Using $(S^2)^\rho{}_\sigma = g^{\rho\lambda} f_{\lambda\sigma}$, the contributions $V_{\mu\nu}$ and $\tilde{V}_{\mu\nu}$ (6) to the bimetric equations become,

$$g^{\rho\mu} V_{\mu\nu} = V\delta^\rho_\nu - 2g^{\rho\mu}\frac{\partial V}{\partial (S^2)^\lambda{}_\sigma}\frac{\partial (S^2)^\lambda{}_\sigma}{\partial g^{\mu\nu}} = V\delta^\rho_\nu - 2\frac{\partial V}{\partial (S^2)^\mu{}_\sigma} g^{\rho\mu} f_{\sigma\nu}\,, \tag{22}$$

$$\sqrt{|g^{-1}f|}\, f^{\rho\mu}\tilde{V}_{\mu\nu} = -2f^{\rho\mu}\frac{\partial V}{\delta (S^2)^\lambda{}_\sigma}\frac{\partial (S^2)^\lambda{}_\sigma}{\partial f^{\mu\nu}} = 2\frac{\partial V}{\partial (S^2)^\mu{}_\sigma} g^{\rho\mu} f_{\sigma\nu}\,. \tag{23}$$

An immediate consequence is the identity,[b]

$$\sqrt{|g|}\, g^{\rho\sigma} V_{\sigma\nu} + \sqrt{|f|}\, f^{\rho\sigma}\tilde{V}_{\sigma\nu} - \sqrt{|g|}\, V\delta^\rho{}_\nu = 0\,. \tag{24}$$

Using this in the sum of the equations of motion (5) gives,

$$g^{\rho\sigma}\mathcal{G}_{\sigma\nu} + \alpha^2\sqrt{|g^{-1}f|}\, f^{\rho\sigma}\tilde{\mathcal{G}}_{\sigma\nu} + m_g^{-2}m^4\, V\delta^\rho{}_\nu = 0\,. \tag{25}$$

Now suppose that one of the two metrics, say $f_{\mu\nu}$, satisfies vacuum Einstein equations with cosmological constant $\tilde{\Lambda}$, i.e. $\tilde{\mathcal{G}}_{\mu\nu} + \tilde{\Lambda} f_{\mu\nu} = 0$. Then,

$$g^{\rho\sigma}\mathcal{G}_{\sigma\nu} = \left(\alpha^2\tilde{\Lambda}\sqrt{|g^{-1}f|} - m_g^{-2}m^4 V\right)\delta^\rho{}_\nu\,. \tag{26}$$

and the Bianchi identity, $\nabla_\rho \mathcal{G}^\rho{}_\nu = 0$ gives,

$$\partial_\nu\left(\alpha^2\tilde{\Lambda}\sqrt{|g^{-1}f|} - m_g^{-2}m^4\, V\right) = 0\,. \tag{27}$$

It is then obvious that $g_{\mu\nu}$ also satisfies $\mathcal{G}_{\mu\nu} + \Lambda g_{\mu\nu} = 0$ with a constant $\Lambda = m_g^{-2}m^4\, V - \alpha^2\tilde{\Lambda}\det S$. Of course, this argument also works starting with $g_{\mu\nu}$ as an Einstein metric.

This shows that *in any bimetric theory, if either one of the two metrics is Einstein, then the equations of motion force the other one to be Einstein as well.* The

[b]This identify was first noticed in[22] for the potential V in (2). The derivation here shows that it holds for any scalar function of $g^{-1}f$.

proportional solutions, $f_{\mu\nu} = c^2 g_{\mu\nu}$, discussed in the previous section are special cases of such Einstein backgrounds. But generically, the two Einstein metrics are not necessarily proportional (due to the polynomial matrix structure of V).

In contrast to the bimetric result, in massive gravity the reference metric is always Einstein but there is no such constraint on the second metric. The constraint is lost in the massive gravity limit. In this limit, a number of different bimetric solutions for $f_{\mu\nu}$ reduce to the same Einstein metric, while the corresponding solutions for $g_{\mu\nu}$ remain distinct. Thus, this correspondence between $g_{\mu\nu}$ and $f_{\mu\nu}$ solutions is lost in the limit.

The general relativity limit:

When $\alpha \to 0$, for fixed m_g (i.e. small m_f), the fluctuation δg around proportional backgrounds becomes massless. This is the General Relativity limit.[1,3] The identity (24) implements this nonlinearly. In this limit, the $f_{\mu\nu}$ equation is $\tilde{V}_{\mu\nu} = 0$ and (24) implies that $g_{\mu\nu}$ satisfies the Einstein equation with cosmological constant $V =$const., as observed in.[6,19] The same holds in the presence of a conserved $g_{\mu\nu}$ source. Therefore, any bimetric model has solutions that can be brought arbitrarily close to GR solutions by adjusting α, irrespective of the mass scale, avoiding the vDVZ discontinuity (this obviously is not possible in massive gravity, where α has already been taken to be infinite). Small m_f is of course a strong coupling limit for the $f_{\mu\nu}$ sector. In the limit the effect of this strong coupling is to suppress the dynamics of $f_{\mu\nu}$ and completely determine it in terms of $g_{\mu\nu}$ such that the later becomes a GR solution. The $g_{\mu\nu}$ sector however does not exhibit strong coupling.

3.2. *The β_i-models: Einstein implies proportional*

The above result holds for any bimetric theory with a covariant interaction potential. Now we consider a more restricted class of models where, of the five β_n parameters ($n = 0, \cdots, 4$) in (2), the non-zero ones are β_0 β_4, and only one of the remaining β_i, where $i = 1, 2, 3$. Following,[23] we call these the β_i-models. For these models we show that if one metric is Einstein, then the other metric is not only Einstein, but also proportional to the first metric.

The β_1 and β_3-models

Let us first consider the β_1-model (where $\beta_2 = \beta_3 = 0$). In this case the $g_{\mu\nu}$ equations is,

$$g^{\rho\sigma}\mathcal{G}_{\sigma\nu} + \tfrac{m^4}{m_g^2}\Big(\beta_0\delta^\rho{}_\nu + \beta_1\left[S^\rho{}_\nu - e_1(S)\delta^\rho{}_\nu\right]\Big) = 0\,. \tag{28}$$

Now assume that $g_{\mu\nu}$ is an Einstein metric, $\mathcal{G}_{\sigma\nu} = -\Lambda g_{\sigma\nu}$. Since $e_1(S) = \mathrm{Tr}\, S$, it is easy to see that (28) implies $S^\rho{}_\nu = c\delta^\rho{}_\nu$ with $c = \frac{1}{3\beta_1}\left(\beta_0 - \frac{m_g^2\Lambda}{m^4}\right)$. Since $S^2 = g^{-1}f$ it follows that $f_{\mu\nu} = c^2 g_{\mu\nu}$. Conversely, as demonstrated in the previous subsection,

assuming $f_{\mu\nu}$ to be Einstein always forces $g_{\mu\nu}$ to be Einstein as well and again the above argument applies.

Due to the interchange property of the potential (4), the same conclusions can be drawn for the β_3-model (defined by $\beta_1 = \beta_2 = 0$), now using the $f_{\mu\nu}$ equation for S^{-1}. This shows that, in the β_1 and β_3-models, if either metric is assumed to be Einstein, then the equations force the other metric to be not only Einstein, but of the form $f = c^2 g$.

The β_2-models

Now consider the β_2-models (defined by $\beta_1 = \beta_3 = 0$) and assume that one of the metrics is Einstein. Then, by the general arguments in section 3.1, the second metric will also be Einstein. Again we denote the respective cosmological constants by Λ and $\tilde{\Lambda}$. In terms of the constants $\lambda_g \equiv \beta_0 - m_g^2 m^{-4}\Lambda$ and $\lambda_f \equiv \beta_4 - m_f^2 m^{-4}\tilde{\Lambda}$, the equations of motion become,

$$\lambda_g \delta^\rho{}_\nu + \beta_2 \left[S^\rho{}_\sigma S^\sigma{}_\nu - e_1(S) S^\rho{}_\nu + e_2(S)\delta^\rho{}_\nu\right] = 0\,, \tag{29}$$

$$\lambda_f \delta^\rho{}_\nu + \beta_2 \left[(S^{-1})^\rho{}_\sigma (S^{-1})^\sigma{}_\nu - \frac{e_3(S)}{e_4(S)}(S^{-1})^\rho{}_\nu + \frac{e_2(S)}{e_4(S)}\delta^\rho{}_\nu\right] = 0\,. \tag{30}$$

In the second equation, we have used the identity listed above (4) to re-express $e_n(S^{-1})$ in terms of $e_n(S)$. Tracing the above equations gives,

$$2\lambda_g + \beta_2 e_2(S) = 0\,, \qquad 2\lambda_f e_4(S) + \beta_2 e_2(S) = 0\,. \tag{31}$$

It follows that $e_2(S)$ and $e_4(S)$ are constant,[c]

$$e_2(S) = -\frac{2\lambda_g}{\beta_2}\,, \qquad e_4(S) = \frac{\lambda_g}{\lambda_f}\,. \tag{32}$$

Let us also multiply the equations (29) and (30) by S and S^{-1}, respectively, and take the trace of the results. Making use of (4) and (9) we then obtain,

$$\lambda_g e_1(S) + 3\beta_2 e_3(S) = 0\,, \qquad \lambda_f e_3(S) + 3\beta_2 e_1(S) = 0\,. \tag{33}$$

These equations fix the value of one of the cosmological constants because they imply,

$$\lambda_g \lambda_f = 9\beta_2^2\,. \tag{34}$$

Moreover, the relations (31) can be used to bring the equations of motion into the form,

$$\lambda_g \delta^\rho{}_\nu - \beta_2 \left[S^\rho{}_\sigma S^\sigma{}_\nu - e_1(S) S^\rho{}_\nu\right] = 0\,, \tag{35}$$

$$\lambda_f \delta^\rho{}_\nu - \beta_2 \left[(S^{-1})^\rho{}_\sigma (S^{-1})^\sigma{}_\nu - \frac{e_3(S)}{e_4(S)}(S^{-1})^\rho{}_\nu\right] = 0\,. \tag{36}$$

[c] $\lambda_f = 0$ or $\lambda_g = 0$ are ruled out since they require $S = 0$ which makes the starting equations ill defined.

Multiplying the second equation by $\beta_2 S^2$ and subtracting it from λ_f times the first gives,

$$\left[\lambda_f \beta_2 e_1(S) + \beta_2^2 \frac{e_3(S)}{e_4(S)}\right] S^\rho{}_\nu + \left(\lambda_f \lambda_g - \beta_2^2\right) \delta^\rho{}_\nu = 0\,. \tag{37}$$

This result can be simplified further using (32) and (34) to get,

$$3\beta_2 e_1(S) S^\rho{}_\nu + 4\lambda_g \delta^\rho{}_\nu = 0\,. \tag{38}$$

Tracing this expression yields,[d]

$$e_1(S) = \pm 4\sqrt{-\tfrac{\lambda_g}{3\beta_2}}\,. \tag{39}$$

Plugging this back into (38), finally leads to,

$$S^\rho{}_\nu = c\,\delta^\rho{}_\nu\,, \qquad c = \pm\sqrt{\frac{m_g^2\Lambda/m^4 - \beta_0}{3\beta_2}}\,, \tag{40}$$

which implies $f_{\mu\nu} = c^2 g_{\mu\nu}$. Hence, also in this model, assuming either metric to be a solution to Einstein's vacuum equations inevitably leads to proportional solutions.

3.3. *Effect of matter couplings*

Let us briefly comment on how the situation generalizes when one includes couplings of the two metrics to matter. The equations of motion with stress-energy tensors $T_{\mu\nu}$ and $\tilde{T}_{\mu\nu}$ are,

$$g^{\rho\sigma}\mathcal{G}_{\sigma\nu} + \tfrac{m^4}{m_g^2} g^{\rho\sigma} V_{\sigma\nu} = \tfrac{1}{m_g^2} g^{\rho\sigma} T_{\sigma\nu}\,, \tag{41}$$

$$\alpha^2 f^{\rho\sigma}\tilde{\mathcal{G}}_{\sigma\nu} + \tfrac{m^4}{m_g^2} f^{\rho\sigma}\tilde{V}_{\sigma\nu} = \tfrac{1}{m_g^2} f^{\rho\sigma}\tilde{T}_{\sigma\nu}\,. \tag{42}$$

The Bianchi constraints only force a combination of the sources to be conserved. But demanding the separate general covariance of the matter couplings in the action implies $\nabla^\rho T_{\rho\nu} = \tilde{\nabla}^\rho \tilde{T}_{\rho\nu} = 0$, which is what we assume. While without sources, Einstein solutions always exist, in the presence of sources, GR solutions exist only when allowed by the source. When this is the case, following the same strategy as before, it is easy to see that the identity (24) together with the equations of motion now imply the following:

- If one of the metrics solves Einstein's equations with a source, i.e., it is a GR solution, then the other metric will also be a GR solution, for appropriate sources. A few non-proportional GR solutions with sources have been found, see e.g.,[10]
- Restricting to the β_i-models will again force the GR metrics to be proportional, $f_{\mu\nu} = c^2 g_{\mu\nu}$, provided the sources satisfy $\alpha^2 T_{\mu\nu} = \tilde{T}_{\mu\nu}$. Unless the sources meet this condition on-shell, there exist no GR solutions for either one of the metrics.

[d] Imaginary solutions are not ruled out since the original equations contain only even powers of S.

3.4. *Implications for ill-behaved solutions*

Classical solutions of the bimetric theory have been obtained for cosmological as well as spherically symmetric metrics (see e.g.[24–28]).[e] Along with good solutions, sometimes one also finds another branch of solutions with pathologies, in common with massive gravity. Examples are:

(i) Solutions with determinant singularities where the ratio $\det f / \det g$ becomes singular, while curvature invariants are well behaved.[10]
(ii) Solutions with nonlinear ghosts where the linear and nonlinear theories have different numbers of degrees of freedom.[11,12,32]

These pathological branches always include solutions where one of the metrics solves Einstein's equations while the other metric is not proportional to it. It is then obvious that such pathological solutions cannot arise in the β_i-models, where Einstein backgrounds are inevitably proportional backgrounds, as shown in the previous section.

Let us comment on this advantage of the β_i models in some more detail in the context of cosmological solutions. For homogeneous and isotropic metrics (see e.g.[25]), the Bianchi constraint (10) factorizes in a way that allows for two disconnected branches of solutions,

$$(\beta_1 \Upsilon + 2\beta_2 \Upsilon^2 + \beta_3 \Upsilon^3)\, B = 0\,. \tag{43}$$

Here, Υ is the ratio of the spatial scale factors and B is a function of metric components and their time-derivatives. Clearly, there are two ways to solve (43), either by setting the bracket to zero or by requiring $B = 0$. These two options are called "branch I" and "branch II" solutions, respectively. It is branch I that gives rise to the pathologies mentioned above. In the β_i models, this branch does not exist since $\Upsilon = 0$ results in a singular metric.

Note that the bracket which vanishes on the branch I solutions becomes proportional to the Fierz-Pauli mass (16) when Υ is identified with the constant c of the proportional backgrounds. One can even define an effective (time-dependent) mass for the scalar perturbations which vanishes on branch I.[33] As discussed in,[11,12] this branch appears to be a pathological class of cosmological solutions. An abrupt loss of degrees of freedom occurs in the linearized theory, accompanied by a non-perturbative, genuine ghost instability.[f] On top of that, the authors of[10] found that determinant singularities are likely to be generic within branch I of the cosmological backgrounds in bimetric theory. These problem are avoided by models that do not allow for branch I solutions, which are precisely the β_i models.

A seemingly unrelated question, first raised in,[35] is the violation of the null energy condition for the effective stress-energies as set up by the interaction potential.

[e]For further work of cosmological relevance see e.g.[29–31]

[f]Branch II solutions could also have usual types of instabilities in some parameter regions, related to strong coupling or violation of the Higuchi bound.[32,34] These are not on the same footing as branch I problems.

In general it is not completely clear what such a violation means physically since the bimetric interactions considered here are not part of the matter sector. It is nevertheless interesting that[35] concluded that one of the effective stress-energies must always violate the null energy condition apart from the exceptional case when the metrics are proportional. Within the β_i-models, whenever one metric is Einstein and has a well-defined notion of energy connected to it, then the two metrics are forced to be proportional and hence avoid any pathologies connected to a possible violation of the null-energy condition.

4. Bimetric solutions with no massive gravity limit

In this section we focus on bimetric solutions that do not admit a massive gravity limit. As explicit examples, we first consider proportional solutions and then study the behavior of generic solutions in a class of "symmetric" bimetric models. Finally we discuss the implications of this for the massive gravity limit of the candidate PM bimetric model (which is a symmetric model as well as a β_2-model).

4.1. *Proportional solutions with no massive gravity limit*

As in section 2.3, we define the massive gravity limit as $\alpha = m_f/m_g \to \infty$ at fixed m_g, so that $g_{\mu\nu}$ becomes the massive field. As emphasized there, to find a massive gravity action, one needs bimetric solutions with a good massive gravity limit, which is not always the case.

As a warmup, consider proportional solutions $f = c^2 g$ in a bimetric model with only β_0 and β_1 nonvanishing. In this case, equation (15) gives two solutions for c,

$$c_\pm = \tfrac{1}{6\beta_1}\left(-\beta_0 \pm \sqrt{\beta_0^2 + 12\alpha^{-2}\beta_1^2}\right) \tag{44}$$

In the massive gravity limit, $c_- = -\beta_0/3\beta_1$ while $c_+ = 0$ (for $\beta_0 > 0$). Hence the class of bimetric solutions that are connected to c_+ do not have a continuous massive gravity limit with both metrics remaining well defined. In this case, formally setting $f_{\mu\nu} = 0$ in the action (ignoring that the curvatures are not defined and the equations break down) will eliminate the mass potential giving massless GR which is not a continuous limit of massive gravity. Below we consider models where both metrics become singular in the limit.

We now turn to an interesting class of "symmetric" bimetric models with parameters β_n satisfying,

$$\alpha^{4-n}\beta_n = \alpha^n \beta_{4-n}\,. \tag{45}$$

Then the bimetric action is invariant under the interchange,

$$\alpha^{-1} g_{\mu\nu} \leftrightarrow \alpha f_{\mu\nu}\,. \tag{46}$$

without having to interchange the β_n. In other words, the interchanges (12) now map the model to itself.[g]

In order to get a finite massive gravity limit with nontrivial interactions, we need to further specify the scaling of the parameters with α by assuming fixed β_2 and β_3 and setting $\beta_4 = \alpha^2\beta_4'$ with fixed β_4'. For this class of models, the bimetric equations of motion become,

$$\mathcal{G}^\rho{}_\nu = -\tfrac{m^4}{m_g^2}\left(\alpha^{-2}\beta_4'\,\mathbb{1} + \alpha^{-2}\beta_3 Y_{(1)}(S) + \beta_2 Y_{(2)}(S) + \beta_3 Y_{(3)}(S)\right)^\rho{}_\nu\,, \tag{47}$$

$$\tilde{\mathcal{G}}^\rho{}_\nu = -\tfrac{m^4}{m_g^2}\left(\beta_4'\,\mathbb{1} + \alpha^{-2}\beta_3 Y_{(1)}(S^{-1}) + \alpha^{-2}\beta_2 Y_{(2)}(S^{-1}) + \alpha^{-4}\beta_3 Y_{(3)}(S^{-1})\right)^\rho{}_\nu\,. \tag{48}$$

The massive gravity limit of the equations can be found easily. The scalings chosen insure the survival of the β_2 and β_3 interactions in the $\alpha \to \infty$ limit but, at the same time, $\beta_0 = \alpha^{-2}\beta_4'$ and $\beta_1 = \alpha^{-2}\beta_3$ both disappear. This is the most general scaling behavior of the parameters (45) with a well-defined massive gravity limit for the equations.

Let us now consider proportional solutions $f_{\mu\nu} = c^2 g_{\mu\nu}$ to the above equations. In this case equation (15) which determines c becomes,

$$\alpha^{-1}\beta_3 + (3\beta_2 - \beta_4')\alpha c - (3\beta_2 - \beta_4')\alpha^3 c^3 - \beta_3\alpha^3 c^4 = 0\,. \tag{49}$$

For general β_2, β_3 and β_4', this has four solutions,

$$c_{(1)}^{\pm} = \pm\frac{1}{\alpha}\,, \qquad c_{(2)}^{\pm} = \frac{3\beta_2 - \beta_4'}{2\beta_3}\left(-1 \pm \sqrt{1 - \tfrac{4\beta_3^2}{\alpha^2(3\beta_2-\beta_4')^2}}\right)\,. \tag{50}$$

The interchange $\alpha^{-1}g_{\mu\nu} \leftrightarrow \alpha f_{\mu\nu}$ amounts to $\alpha c \to \alpha^{-1}c^{-1}$ on the above solutions. While this keeps the first two solutions in (50) invariant, the other two transform into each other.

In the limit, $\alpha \to \infty$, only $c_{(2)}^-$ gives rise to a well defined massive gravity,

$$c_{(2)}^- \to \frac{\beta_4' - 3\beta_2}{\beta_3}\,. \tag{51}$$

The other three solutions vanish and at least one of the metrics becomes singular. In particular, the solution $c_{(2)}^+$ obtainable from $c_{(2)}^-$ through the interchange (46) becomes ill-defined. Classes of bimetric solutions connected to these are lost in the massive gravity limit.

The class of models considered above contains the candidate PM bimetric model, discussed in section 4.4. A motivation for showing the existence of solutions with no massive gravity limit is to argue that such a limit of the candidate PM bimetric

[g]In the presence of matter the interchange symmetry can only be preserved for very specific couplings to the metrics. Here we only consider the classical vacuum equations, in particular since the presence of generic matter couplings would anyway spoil the possible nonlinear PM symmetry discussed in a subsequent section. For recent work on the consistency of matter couplings in bimetric theory see.[36,37]

theory involves a truncation of the solution space that also destroys a possible on-shell gauge symmetry of the theory, except around very special backgrounds. But, considering proportional backgrounds alone is not enough for this argument, since in the PM case equation (15) leaves c undetermined. In that case, c and its α-dependence are gauge dependent. To overcome this, in the following we consider the massive gravity limit of generic solutions.

4.2. *Generic solutions with a massive gravity limit*

For the bimetric equations (47)-(48), we first consider the general form of solutions with a good massive gravity limit. Solutions without such a limit are obtained in the next subsection. Arranged in powers of α, equations (47)-(48) have the form,

$$\mathcal{G}(g) = V^{(0)}(g,f) + \alpha^{-2}V^{(2)}(g,f)\,, \tag{52}$$

$$\tilde{\mathcal{G}}(f) = \tilde{V}^{(0)}(f) + \alpha^{-2}\tilde{V}^{(2)}(g,f) + \alpha^{-4}\tilde{V}^{(4)}(g,f)\,, \tag{53}$$

where $\mathcal{G}$ is the matrix notation for the Einstein tensor $\mathcal{G}_{\mu\nu}$ and the matrices $V^{(n)}$ and $\tilde{V}^{(n)}$ can be read off from (47)-(48) by comparing powers of α.

In the limit $\alpha \to \infty$, only the lowest-order, α-independent terms survive. Hence, for large enough α, all bimetric solutions with a massive gravity limit must be expandable as,

$$f_{\mu\nu} = \bar{f}_{\mu\nu} + \alpha^{-2}\psi_{\mu\nu} + \mathcal{O}(\alpha^{-4})\,, \qquad g_{\mu\nu} = \phi_{\mu\nu} + \alpha^{-2}\chi_{\mu\nu} + \mathcal{O}(\alpha^{-4})\,. \tag{54}$$

Since these solve the equations to order α^{-2}, the above functions must satisfy,

$$\mathcal{G}(\phi) = V^{(0)}(\phi,\bar{f})\,, \qquad \left.\frac{\delta(\mathcal{G}+V^{(0)})}{\delta g_{\mu\nu}}\right|_{\bar{f},\,\phi}\chi_{\mu\nu} + \left.\frac{\delta V^{(0)}}{\delta f_{\mu\nu}}\right|_{\bar{f},\,\phi}\psi_{\mu\nu} + V^{(2)}(\phi,\bar{f}) = 0\,, \tag{55}$$

$$\tilde{\mathcal{G}}(\bar{f}) = \tilde{V}^{(0)}(\bar{f})\,, \qquad \left.\frac{\delta(\tilde{\mathcal{G}}+\tilde{V}^{(0)})}{\delta f_{\mu\nu}}\right|_{\bar{f}}\psi_{\mu\nu} + \tilde{V}^{(2)}(\phi,\bar{f}) = 0\,. \tag{56}$$

Note that since $\tilde{\mathcal{G}}(\bar{f}) = \tilde{V}^{(0)}(\bar{f})$ is simply an Einstein equation with cosmological constant, this implies that $\bar{f}_{\mu\nu}$ is Einstein. Accordingly, $\left.\frac{\delta(\tilde{\mathcal{G}}+\tilde{V}^{(0)})}{\delta f_{\mu\nu}}\right|_{\bar{f}}$ is the linearized Einstein operator. The lowest order term $\phi_{\mu\nu}$ in the solution for $g_{\mu\nu}$, as well as the $\mathcal{O}(\alpha^{-2})$ contributions $\psi_{\mu\nu}$ and $\chi_{\mu\nu}$ in both metrics are generic (α-independent) functions determined by the above equations.

Solutions of the form (54) must exist in bimetric theory, or else there would be no massive gravity limit. In the limit, $f_{\mu\nu} = \bar{f}_{\mu\nu}$ is Einstein and $g_{\mu\nu} = \phi_{\mu\nu}$ possibly differs from an Einstein metric. This also explicitly captures the constraint on bimetric solutions that is lost in massive gravity: If $g_{\mu\nu}$ in bimetric theory is not Einstein then neither is $f_{\mu\nu}$, but its difference from the Einstein metric $\bar{f}_{\mu\nu}$ vanishes in the massive gravity limit, while $g_{\mu\nu}$ can remain a non-Einstein metric.

4.3. *Generic solutions without a massive gravity limit*

The symmetry of equations (47)-(48) under (46) is explicit in terms of the rescaled variables,

$$g'_{\mu\nu} \equiv \alpha^{-1} g_{\mu\nu}\,, \qquad f'_{\mu\nu} \equiv \alpha f_{\mu\nu}\,. \tag{57}$$

In terms of these the equations of motion (47)-(48) have the form,

$$\mathcal{G}(g') = \alpha^{-1} V^{(0)}(g', f') + \alpha^{-2} V^{(2)}(g', f')\,, \tag{58}$$

$$\mathcal{G}(f') = \alpha^{-1} V^{(0)}(f', g') + \alpha^{-2} V^{(2)}(f', g')\,, \tag{59}$$

which are now manifestly invariant under the interchange,[h]

$$g'_{\mu\nu} \longleftrightarrow f'_{\mu\nu}\,. \tag{60}$$

The solution (54) in terms of the new variables reads,

$$f'_{\mu\nu} = \alpha\left(\bar{f}_{\mu\nu} + \alpha^{-2}\psi_{\mu\nu}\right) + \mathcal{O}(\alpha^{-3})\,, \qquad g'_{\mu\nu} = \alpha^{-1}\left(\phi_{\mu\nu} + \alpha^{-2}\chi_{\mu\nu}\right) + \mathcal{O}(\alpha^{-4}) \tag{61}$$

The crucial point is that, due to the interchange symmetry, the above bimetric equations also admit another solution that is obtained by applying (60) to (61). The new solution is,

$$g'_{\mu\nu} = \alpha\left(\bar{f}_{\mu\nu} + \alpha^{-2}\psi_{\mu\nu}\right) + \mathcal{O}(\alpha^{-3})\,, \qquad f'_{\mu\nu} = \alpha^{-1}\left(\phi_{\mu\nu} + \alpha^{-2}\chi_{\mu\nu}\right) + \mathcal{O}(\alpha^{-4}) \tag{62}$$

In terms of the original variables, this becomes,

$$g_{\mu\nu} = \alpha^2 \bar{f}_{\mu\nu} + \psi_{\mu\nu} + \mathcal{O}(\alpha^{-2})\,, \qquad f_{\mu\nu} = \frac{1}{\alpha^2}\phi_{\mu\nu} + \frac{1}{\alpha^4}\chi_{\mu\nu} + \mathcal{O}(\alpha^{-6})\,, \tag{63}$$

By inserting this into the equations and separating different orders of α, one can explicitly verify that (63) is a perturbative solution provided (55)-(56) hold.

Now, unlike (54), in the limit $\alpha \to \infty$ both metrics become singular and the solution has no massive gravity limit. This result is general and also holds for the parameter values corresponding to the candidate PM bimetric theory.

4.4. *Implications for a nonlinear PM symmetry*

The linear partially massless spin-2 theory is formulated around de Sitter or Einstein backgrounds.[17] The bimetric model with parameters,[i]

$$\beta_1 = \beta_3 = 0\,, \qquad \alpha^2\beta_0 = 3\beta_2 = \alpha^{-2}\beta_4 \tag{64}$$

emerges as the unique candidate with the potential to provide a nonlinear realization of the PM phenomenon in the bimetric framework.[13,18,38] If so, this theory must

[h]The action (1) also takes a symmetric form, $m_g^2\alpha\int \mathrm{d}^4x\{\sqrt{|g'|}[R(g') - 2\tilde{m}^2\,(\beta_0 + \beta_1\alpha^{-1}e_1(S') + \frac{1}{2}\beta_2\alpha^{-2}e_2(S'))] + \sqrt{|f'|}[R(f') - 2\tilde{m}^2(\beta_0 + \beta_1\alpha^{-1}e_1(S'^{-1}) + \frac{1}{2}\beta_2\alpha^{-2}e_2(S'^{-1}))]\}$. Although our considerations are completely at the classical level, quantum corrections are expected to preserve the interchange symmetry if the quantization procedure respects the symmetry.

[i]Note that this model is in the intersection of the β_i models discussed in section 3 and the symmetric models considered in this section. Hence both results hold for this model.

have a gauge invariance and propagate six (rather than seven) modes. This has been difficult to prove, due to the intricate structure of the theory, but there is some evidence for it beyond the linear theory around Einstein backgrounds.[38,39] Hence there is a possibility that this model, or some appropriate generalization of it, could have a gauge symmetry. On the other hand, there have also been arguments that such a nonlinear generalization does not exist.[20,40–42j] Here we focus on the most common argument, based on the massive gravity limit.

PM massive gravity was investigated in[40,43] and can be obtained from the bimetric model (64) in the limit $\alpha \to \infty$ with β_2 held fixed and $\beta_0 \to 0$.[k] It has been argued that this limit cannot exhibit a PM symmetry nonlinearly.[40,41] It is then stated that since massive gravity is a well-behaved limit of bimetric theory, the same conclusion must also apply to the bimetric model (64).[20,21,40,41] This argument assumes that if a PM bimetric model exists, its gauge symmetry would survive in the massive gravity limit.

From the discussion above it is clear that massive gravity does not only involve taking a limit of bimetric theory, but it also amounts to truncating the space of bimetric solutions to a single class leading to a specific massive gravity reference metric. In particular, bimetric solutions that become singular in the limit are discarded. It is obvious that if the bimetric model (64) has a gauge symmetry that cannot be truncated in the same way, then it will not survive in the massive gravity limit.

There is evidence that this is indeed the case. In[38] it was shown that, in a perturbative treatment in powers of curvatures, one can eliminate one of the metrics, say $f_{\mu\nu}$, between the bimetric equations (47)-(48) to get a single equation for $g_{\mu\nu}$. At the lowest order, this gives the equation of motion for conformal gravity with Weyl scalings as a gauge symmetry. Derivative corrections to the Weyl scaling can be computed at low orders.[38,39] This provides an on-shell, nonlinear and background independent extension of the linear PM symmetry.

It turns out that for generic non-proportional solutions, these gauge transformations diverge in the limit $\alpha \to \infty$ (when the perturbative relation to conformal gravity also breaks down). Only for proportional backgrounds (and simple solutions like the cosmological ones[25]), the terms with higher powers of α in the perturbative expansions vanish and the transformations admit a massive gravity limit. Thus away from this limited class of solutions, the known gauge transformations do not admit a massive gravity truncation. The picture that emerges, then, is that gauge transformations without a massive gravity limit relate bimetric solutions with a massive gravity limit to solutions that are singular in the limit. The existence of

[j] A detailed analysis of these arguments will be presented in.[39] There, more evidence for the presence of an on-shell gauge symmetry is provided and it is also shown that the counter arguments so far do not rule out a bimetric theory with a nonlinear symmetry.

[k] Even non-PM bimetric models with $\beta_0 = \beta_0'/\alpha^2$ lead to the PM massive gravity. Hence a massive gravity background does not have a unique bimetric extension.

such solutions has been explicitly shown here. Hence we expect that if the bimetric theory (64) has a nonlinear gauge symmetry, this will not survive in the massive gravity limit, except around a limited set of backgrounds. In particular, they will not survive for massive gravity backgrounds that appreciably differ from proportional backgrounds.

Acknowledgments

We thank M. Crisostomi, J. Enander, A. E. Gumrukcuoglu, W. Hu, E. Mörtsell and L. Pilo for useful discussions. MvS wishes to acknowledge the creative environment supplied by the SW8 workshop, "Hot Topics in Modern Cosmology", held at IESC in Cargèse this year. The research of MvS leading to these results has received funding from the European Research Council under the European Communitys Seventh Framework Programme (FP7/2007-2013 Grant Agreement no. 307934).

References

1. S. F. Hassan and R. A. Rosen, JHEP **1202** (2012) 126 [arXiv:1109.3515 [hep-th]].
2. S. F. Hassan and R. A. Rosen, JHEP **1204** (2012) 123 [arXiv:1111.2070 [hep-th]].
3. S. F. Hassan, A. Schmidt-May and M. von Strauss, JHEP **1305** (2013) 086 [arXiv:1208.1515 [hep-th]].
4. C. de Rham and G. Gabadadze, Phys. Rev. D **82** (2010) 044020 [arXiv:1007.0443 [hep-th]].
5. C. de Rham, G. Gabadadze and A. J. Tolley, Phys. Rev. Lett. **106** (2011) 231101 [arXiv:1011.1232 [hep-th]].
6. S. F. Hassan and R. A. Rosen, JHEP **1107** (2011) 009 [arXiv:1103.6055 [hep-th]].
7. S. F. Hassan and R. A. Rosen, Phys. Rev. Lett. **108** (2012) 041101 [arXiv:1106.3344 [hep-th]].
8. S. F. Hassan, R. A. Rosen and A. Schmidt-May, JHEP **1202** (2012) 026 [arXiv:1109.3230 [hep-th]].
9. D. G. Boulware and S. Deser, Phys. Lett. B **40** (1972) 227.
10. P. Gratia, W. Hu and M. Wyman, Phys. Rev. D **89** (2014) 027502 [arXiv:1309.5947 [hep-th]].
11. A. E. Gumrukcuoglu, C. Lin and S. Mukohyama, JCAP **1203** (2012) 006 [arXiv:1111.4107 [hep-th]].
12. A. De Felice, A. E. Gumrukcuoglu and S. Mukohyama, Phys. Rev. Lett. **109** (2012) 171101 [arXiv:1206.2080 [hep-th]].
13. S. F. Hassan, A. Schmidt-May and M. von Strauss, Class. Quant. Grav. **30** (2013) 184010 [arXiv:1212.4525 [hep-th]].
14. A. Higuchi, Nucl. Phys. B **282** (1987) 397.
15. E. Babichev and A. Fabbri, Class. Quant. Grav. **30** (2013) 152001 [arXiv:1304.5992 [gr-qc]].
16. R. Brito, V. Cardoso and P. Pani, Phys. Rev. D **88** (2013) 2, 023514 [arXiv:1304.6725 [gr-qc]].
17. S. Deser and A. Waldron, Nucl. Phys. B **607** (2001) 577 [hep-th/0103198].
18. S. F. Hassan, A. Schmidt-May and M. von Strauss, Phys. Lett. B **726,** (2013) 834 [arXiv:1208.1797 [hep-th]].
19. V. Baccetti, P. Martin-Moruno and M. Visser, Class. Quant. Grav. **30** (2013) 015004 [arXiv:1205.2158 [gr-qc]].

20. M. Fasiello and A. J. Tolley, JCAP **1312** (2013) 002 [arXiv:1308.1647 [hep-th]].
21. C. de Rham, arXiv:1401.4173 [hep-th].
22. M. S. Volkov, Phys. Rev. D **86** (2012) 104022 [arXiv:1207.3723 [hep-th]].
23. F. Koennig, A. Patil and L. Amendola, JCAP **1403** (2014) 029 [arXiv:1312.3208 [astro-ph.CO]].
24. M. S. Volkov, JHEP **1201** (2012) 035 [arXiv:1110.6153 [hep-th]].
25. M. von Strauss, A. Schmidt-May, J. Enander, E. Mortsell and S. F. Hassan, JCAP **1203** (2012) 042 [arXiv:1111.1655 [gr-qc]].
26. D. Comelli, M. Crisostomi, F. Nesti and L. Pilo, JHEP **1203** (2012) 067 [Erratum-ibid. **1206** (2012) 020] [arXiv:1111.1983 [hep-th]].
27. D. Comelli, M. Crisostomi, F. Nesti and L. Pilo, Phys. Rev. D **85** (2012) 024044 [arXiv:1110.4967 [hep-th]].
28. M. S. Volkov, Phys. Rev. D **85** (2012) 124043 [arXiv:1202.6682 [hep-th]].
29. Y. Akrami, T. S. Koivisto and M. Sandstad, JHEP **1303** (2013) 099 [arXiv:1209.0457 [astro-ph.CO]].
30. A. R. Solomon, Y. Akrami and T. S. Koivisto, arXiv:1404.4061 [astro-ph.CO].
31. N. Tamanini, E. N. Saridakis and T. S. Koivisto, JCAP **1402** (2014) 015 [arXiv:1307.5984 [hep-th]].
32. D. Comelli, M. Crisostomi and L. Pilo, arXiv:1403.5679 [hep-th].
33. A. De Felice, A. E. Gumrukcuoglu, S. Mukohyama, N. Tanahashi and T. Tanaka, arXiv:1404.0008 [hep-th].
34. D. Comelli, M. Crisostomi and L. Pilo, JHEP **1206** (2012) 085 [arXiv:1202.1986 [hep-th]].
35. V. Baccetti, P. Martin-Moruno and M. Visser, JHEP **1208** (2012) 148 [arXiv:1206.3814 [gr-qc]].
36. Y. Yamashita, A. De Felice and T. Tanaka, arXiv:1408.0487 [hep-th].
37. C. de Rham, L. Heisenberg and R. H. Ribeiro, arXiv:1408.1678 [hep-th].
38. S. F. Hassan, A. Schmidt-May and M. von Strauss, arXiv:1303.6940 [hep-th].
39. S. F. Hassan, A. Schmidt-May and M. von Strauss, *in preparation*.
40. C. de Rham, K. Hinterbichler, R. A. Rosen and A. J. Tolley, Phys. Rev. D **88** (2013) 2, 024003 [arXiv:1302.0025 [hep-th]].
41. S. Deser, M. Sandora and A. Waldron, Phys. Rev. D **87** (2013) 101501 [arXiv:1301.5621 [hep-th]].
42. E. Joung, W. Li and M. Taronna, arXiv:1406.2335 [hep-th].
43. C. de Rham and S. Renaux-Petel, arXiv:1206.3482 [hep-th].